

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ)

ಸೇರಿದ ರಿಕಾಡ್‌ಎಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳು ಹೋಗುತ್ತ ವೆಂದು ಚಂಸಣಿಗೆ ಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಷ್ಟರಿಂದ ನಕಾರವಾವೂ ಲಾಂಗ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೂಡರೇ ಆ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಶಾಸನಭೋಗಿಂದ ಕೂಡರೇ ನಕಾರದ ಪಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ರಿಕಾಡ್‌ಎಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತೀರಾ?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—Government is very anxious that the new Village Accountants are appointed very early and steps are being taken in that direction. I hope that these appointments will be made very shortly. In some cases the matter has been taken up to the High Court and only in such cases the matter has been delayed. Government have also received some allegations that the old Shanubhogues are not handing over *daftars*, etc. Of course, the Government have taken all precautions.

**Sri M. MALLAPPA.**—In most cases, the Government have appointed hereditary Shanbhogues and posted them to the very place where they were serving and the position of the people has become precarious. Those old Shanbhogues are not discharging their work either as village accountant or as Secretary of the Panchayat and work is suffering. Cannot others be appointed as village accountants in their place?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—According to the rules, the old Shanbhogues also are eligible for appointment as village accountants. Of course, in some cases some relaxation is made in respect of their age and qualifications. After their appointment as fresh officials, their work is to the satisfaction of the department.

### Land Reforms Act Amendments urged by Conference of Land Owners

279. **Sri RATNAKUMAR KATTEMAR (Moodabidri).**—

Will the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the Government have received any resolutions passed at the various Conferences of Land owners held in the State, urging the Government to bring an immediate amendment to the Land Reforms Act;

(b) whether the Government is aware that the Ryotwari Land Owners are not getting the rents since the last five years i.e., from 1965;

(c) whether the Government is forcibly recovering the Land Revenue from such Land Owners ignoring their grievances:

(d) whether the Government has received my representations to the effect that so many tenants have kept the fields fallow since the last eight years or more and that they have not paid the "Levy" also;

(e) whether the tenants are being allowed to remain in possession of the holdings even when they are in arrears of rent for more than two years and at present even up to the last five years contrary to the provisions of the Land Reforms Act;

(f) whether the Government are aware that the Ryotwari Land Owners are not given preference to resume the lands for self-cultivation from the tenants at least up to the ceiling limit?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI (Minister for Revenue).—

(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) The liability of the landlord to pay land Revenue is not contingent on his being able to recover rent.

(d) Yes.

(e) No.

(f) The Landlords are permitted to resume the lands up to the extent permitted by Section 14 read with Section 16.

ಶ್ರೀ ರತ್ನ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಕಟ್ಟೇವಾರ್.—ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಜೆ ಕಾನೂನಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪ್ರತಿ ಶ್ರೀಬ್ರಹ್ಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 1965ನೇ ಇನ್ನಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟರವರೆಗೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೇನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗಾಗಿ ನಲ್ಲಿವೆ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—That is a separate question. If another question is put, I will answer.

ಶ್ರೀ ರತ್ನ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಕಟ್ಟೇವಾರ್.—ತಾವು ಹಿಂದೆ ಭೂಪಾಲೀಕರು ಏನೊಂದು ಮನ್ನಿ ಕ್ಷಾತ್ರಿಕಾರ್ಥಿ ಅಗ್ನಿ ತಿಂಡಿ ವಹಿ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ರಹ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತಿಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಿರಿ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—I have received the representation of those small landholders and big landholders. But the Government have not taken any decision as yet. I had not promised that I would bring any amendments on the floor of this House in this connection. But some amendments are to be brought but they are all formal amendments.

ಶ್ರೀಪಾತ್ರ ಕೆ. ಎನ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ.—ಇಲ್ಲ (ಇ) ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಪಾಲೀಕರು ಭೂಕಂಡಾಯಿವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅವರು ಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ಪಣಾಲು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಕೆಲವು ಹೇಣ್ಣಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಗೇಣಿ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅವರು ಮಾನ ಹಾಸಿಯಾಗಿವ ಹಾಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ ಬಯಸ್ತು ಕೆಳಕಂಷಿಪಾದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಅದರ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಮರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡ್ಡಿವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ನಂಬಿಂಧವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಾನ್ಯಾಯವಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—So far as the payment of land revenue is concerned, it has to be paid according to law and the Land Revenue Act. It is the liability of the landholder to pay land revenue. So far as the recovery of rent is concerned, it all depends upon the relationship between the two or the landholder has to seek remedy in the proper Court.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾನುಕ್ರಿಂತಿ ತೆಚ್ಚಿ.—ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒಂದು ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯೇ ಅಗಿದು, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲ್ಮೈಯನ್ನು ಸದ್ಯವು ನಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿ, ಬಹಳ ಕವಿತೆ ಹಿಡುವಾಗಿದೂ ರೂಪಾಯಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅವರ ಮಣಿಗೆ ನಾಯಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ವಕ್ತು ಲು ಎಬ್ಬುನದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ನಾಯಿ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಒಂದು ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದು ನಿಜವೇ? ಮತ್ತು ಅ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಒಂದು ನಿಜವಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದು ನಿಜವೇ?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—Such a representation has been given. But the Government have not yet taken any decision.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಇದ್ದಿನಬೆಂದು.—(ಇ) ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಭೂಕಂಡಾಯ ಗೇಣಿ ವನ್ನೊಲು ಮಂಡಿ ಪುದನ್ನು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಒಂದು ಕೆಡಿಯಂದ ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೆಡರ್ಲೆ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ವಕ್ತುಲಾಗಳು ಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ಕೆಡದವಿವುದು, ಮತ್ತು ಹೇಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೆಡುವುದು ವರ್ಣ ನಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು, ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಧನಗಳಿಗೂ, ವಕ್ತುಲಾಗಳಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಒಕ್ಕೆಯ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಒಕ್ಕೆಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಒಂದು ಕೆಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲವೇ?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—Liability to pay land revenue by the landlord and the landlord to recover rent are there from time immemorial. This has occurred after the Land Reforms Act came into being.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚೋಳ ರಘುರಾಮ ತೆಚ್ಚಿ.—ಭೂಮಳಿ ವನ್ನೊನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾಯಿಕೆತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗೇಣಿ ವನ್ನೊಲು ಮಾಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ನಾಯಿಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ತಾಹಸಿಲ್ಲಾರು ಉತ್ತರ್ವತ್ತಿ ನೋಡಿ ನಿಣಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ತಾಹಸಿಲ್ಲಾರು ಉತ್ತರ್ವತ್ತಿ ಏಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ನಿಣಯ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ರಾಂಡ್ ಟ್ರಿಮೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಸುಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೇವಲ ಅಜನ್‌F ಅಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ನಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—Tahsildars have issued notifications. In some cases, notifications have been held to be invalid by the High Court. If the matters are pending in the Court and they are being enquired into, for that litigation Government is in no way responsible.

**Smt. WINNIFRED F. FERNANDES.**—What is the action the Government will take if the cases are pending in the Tribunals for more than two years and have not been disposed of?

**Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.**—If the tenant does not pay the rent for two years, the remedy is provided in the Act. So far as the expeditious disposal of cases are concerned, it is for the Tribunals to see that they are disposed of early.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಆಗಲ್ಲೇ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Next question.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಉಪ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I request the hon. member to co-operate with the Chair. I cannot allow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಉಪ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕು.

(The hon. member was seen sitting on the desk)

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Next question 323. The hon. Member is absent.

**Sri M. NAGAPPA.**—Sir, I have been authorised to put the question.

**HON. MEMBERS.**—The House is not in order.

### Question of privilege against Sri Gopala Gowda

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—It is not fair for the hon. Member. As a senior hon. Member Sri Gopala Gowda should be fair to others.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಖ್ಯಾತಿಯ ಮುಂಚಿರಿಗೆ ಏಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಗೌರವ ಗೊತ್ತಾ ಯಾತ್ರೆ.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The other day hon. member knows what had happened. Some members had taken objection.

(*The hon. Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda pulled out the microphone and threw it on the floor of the House.*)

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Harihar).—Sir, as we all know Sri S. Gopal Gowda is interested in the land tenancy. When he is getting up to put a question, heavens would not have fallen if Chair had allowed him to put a question. Everything cannot go on like that.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I think this is something which cannot be allowed. It is a breach of privilege.

**Sri K. PUTTASWAMY** (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs).—I move the motion for breach of privilege against hon. member Sri S. Gopala Gowda . . . . .

**Sri S. BANGARAPPA.**—On a point of order . . . . .

(*Interruptions*)

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—The hon. member is not in good health. If he wants to put one supplementary, you do not allow him to put it. It is unfair.

**Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.**—I have every right to move the motion of breach of privilege.

(*Interruption*)

**Sri S. SIVAPPA.**—The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs knows the parliamentary procedure. How can he move the motion of breach of privilege?

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—When he wants to move it, it will have precedence over other things. We have all seen what happened here. The matter that has taken place is in the view of the entire House.

**Sri M. NAGAPPA.**—The Chair has no right to allow any breach of privilege during question hour.